

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-16, and 21-31 are pending in this application. Claims 27-31 are added by the present response, and recite certain subject matter canceled from the independent claims, and thus do not add any new matter. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-16, and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,865,719 to Nicholas, III. (herein "Nicholas"). That rejection is traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Independent claim 1 is amended by the present response to delete certain language therein, now added in new dependent claim 27, to clarify certain language therein, and to additionally recite the determining part determines for at least one of the display sections whether the information to be contained in a current display section satisfies a prescribed condition based on the display configuration definition information "that has a display mode attribute indicating a conditioned status". That subject matter is supported by the original specification for example at Figures 5 and 6, and see page 21, line 21 to page 22, line 25. Each of the other independent claims 15, 16, 25, and 26 is similarly amended as in independent claim 1.

The features recited in the claims as amended are believed to distinguish over the applied art to Nicholas, as the claims as written positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by Nicholas.

Independent claim 1 now positively recites:

a display data creating part that automatically changes a display format of the current display section to enhance visual recognition if the information to be contained in the current display section satisfies the prescribed condition by creating the display data so that the current display section is expanded when the prescribed condition is satisfied.

The other independent claims recite the identical or similar features.

Such a feature in the claims can address a situation in which display sections can be *automatically* changed. As a non-limiting example, in a display certain sections can be automatically expanded when a certain condition is satisfied, which can thereby attract a user's visual attention. Such an operation is realized in the claims by a display configuration definition that has a display mode attribute indicating a conditioned status.

With respect to the claimed features of “*automatically* changing a display format of a current display section to enhance visual recognition”, the outstanding rejection cites Nicholas at column 2, lines 38-54, especially at lines 53-54; column 11, lines 22-60; column 15, line 8 to column 16, line 28; column 15, line 55 to column 16, line 8; and column 17, lines 25-49.<sup>1</sup>

In reply to those grounds for rejection applicant submits Nicholas does not disclose or suggest *automatically* changing a display format of a current display section to enhance visual recognition in any respect. In contrast to that claimed feature, Nicholas discloses that a *user must manipulate* a display screen to open a desired screen when a message appears on the screen. Nicholas does not automatically expand a screen when a prescribed condition is satisfied.

With respect to the specific citations to Nicholas, first at column 2, lines 38-54 and especially lines 53-54, Nicholas merely discloses different ways of displaying messages, and Nicholas specifically discloses “[i]n response to *user commanded movement of the icon*, the message moves as the icon moves, staying in relation to or adjacent to it so that the message stays within the user's focus of attention” (Nicholas at column 2, lines 57-60). That disclosure in Nicholas indicates a user must manipulate a display screen to open a message, and thus Nicholas does not disclose automatically expand a screen when a prescribed condition is satisfied.

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of April 2, 2008, the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5.

Nicholas at cited column 11, lines 22-60 is also directed to a user selecting different command menus, and again not to automatically expanding a screen when a prescribed condition is satisfied. Nicholas at column 15, line 8 to column 16, line 28 discloses different operations that again a user must execute to change a display, again in contrast to the claimed features. Further, at column 17, lines 25-49 Nicholas merely discloses environments of use, but again does not disclose or suggest automatic changing of a display format to enhance visual recognition if a prescribed condition is satisfied.

Thereby no teachings in Nicholas are directed to the above-noted features recited in each of the claims.

Further, applicant respectfully submits Nicholas does not disclose or suggest the features also now clarified in the claims of a display configuration definition that has a “display mode attribute indicating a conditioned status”.

The outstanding rejection specifically cites Nicholas at column 15, line 55 to column 16, line 8 and column 17, lines 25-29 to meet the limitations of the “determination part” positively recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in the other claims. However, applicant submits Nicholas does not disclose or suggest how an alert notification message immediately appears on a user’s presentation. Applicant submits Nicholas does not disclose or suggest use of a display configuration definition that has a display mode attribute indicating a conditioned status.

In the claimed invention, a display format is automatically changed when information contained in the current display section satisfies a prescribed condition by creating the display data so that the current display section is expanded. Such an operation is realized by the display configuration definition that has a display mode attribute indicating a conditioned status.

As noted above Nicholas does not disclose or suggest any operation of automatically changing a display format. In contrast to the claimed features, in Nicholas a user must manipulate the display screen to open a desired image when a message appears on the screen. Nicholas does not operate to automatically expand a screen when a prescribed condition is satisfied.

In view of the above comments, applicant respectfully submits the claims as written positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by Nicholas, and thus the claims as written patentably distinguish over Nicholas.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)  
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\24's\244421\244421US-AM4.DOC

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423